

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: June 2015

A. General Project Information

1. Agency: DEQ
2. Project Title: RIMS
3. Date Prepared: 5/22/2015
4. Prepared By: Dave Nagel

B. Project Status

1. Overall Health: Yellow
2. Brief description of current project status
 - Schedule is **Yellow** – The project is **14%** behind schedule due to Windsor’s delays in ramping up from two to six FTE developers. Additional delays resulted from Windsor’s lack of deliverable documentation associated with two invoices. Recently the schedule has been adjusted to a more realistic timeframe moving our evaluation from **Red** to **Yellow**
 - IV&V is **Yellow** - The project status per POD IV&V review moved from **Red** to **Yellow** as the revised schedule was approved.
3. Major milestones completed so far:
 - MTDEQ04-1; Phase 1a, Project Plan
 - MTDEQ04-2; Software licenses (nForm, nSpect, & nSite)
 - MTDEQ04-3; Phase 1b, Requirements, Validation and Workflow Analysis
 - MTDEQ04-4 Revised
 - i. Phase 1c, Design and Architecture
 - ii. Less: Design Documentation (10%)
 - iii. Less: Requirements Tractability Matrix (10%)
 - MTDEQ04-5 Revised
 - i. Phase 2a, Development, Test Release 1
 - ii. Phase 2b, Data Conversion Test Release 1
 - iii. Less: Design Documentation (10%)
 - iv. Less: Requirements Tractability Matrix (10%)
4. Next milestone(s):
 - MTDEQ04-4 Balance
 - i. Design Documentation (10%)
 - ii. Requirements Tractability Matrix (10%)
 - MTDEQ04-5 Balance
 - i. Design Documentation (10%)
 - ii. Requirements Tractability Matrix (10%)

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: June 2015

C. Scope Changes

Title and Brief Description	Date Approved	Schedule Impact (weeks)	Budget Impact (\$ amount)
None			

D. Issues and Risks

Title and Brief Description	Date Identified	Planned Resolution	Responsible for Resolution
Resource commitment	2/01/2012	Engage leadership on a regular basis using a variety of venues (project status, Bureau meetings, and Executive meetings).	Staci Stolp
Large core team size	2/01/2012	Identify key decision makers, establish their authority and define the decision making process.	Staci Stolp
Insufficient funding for base system	11/19/2013	Follow change control process and maintain a contingency for the project.	Staci Stolp
Change in regulations	11/19/2013	Add rule/statute change discussion to project status meetings.	Jenny Chambers
Legacy system failure before system implementation	11/19/2013	Converted to Oracle database using MS Access 2010 front-end Action: Update the Disaster Recovery Plan	Kelly Hanna
Current funding gets reduce	11/19/2013	1. Reduce scope 2. Use internal resources (slip schedule) 3. Request additional funding from Leg 4. Set-aside contingency budget for the project	Jenny Chambers
Implemented system does not cover all functionality needed by programs	11/19/2013	Consolidation and re-evaluation of requirements to ensure scope is clearly defined and only includes needed functionality Use internal resources, change	Staci Stolp

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: June 2015

		<p>control, prioritize requirements and program focus</p> <p>Use Project Status, User Experience, PO Demos, and Release Planning Meetings to keep team apprised of functionality and progress.</p> <p>Ensure that shared workflows have visibility across programs during design sessions.</p> <p>Develop a robust UAT test plan and test cases to ensure requirements and functionality is met by system.</p>	
Interpretation of requirements between DEQ and vendor	11/19/2013	<p>Follow contract</p> <p>Use change control process</p> <p>Use vendor/DEQ meeting collaboration meeting to develop SOW</p> <p>Regular project status meetings and Agile planning meetings to ensure State and vendor are on the same page.</p> <p>If discrepancies exist, use established escalation process.</p>	Staci Stolp
Coordination of multiple vendors	6/30/2014	<p>Follow-up regarding status at weekly status meetings and standups, identify roadblocks early, and escalate issues per project processes.</p>	Dave Nagel
State selection of Enterprise Content Management different than Alfresco	9/22/2014	<p>Open design architecture</p> <p>Well maintained requirements, design and architecture documentation to aid in transition to new system.</p>	Dan Chelini
Interfacing with State and DEQ internal systems	9/25/2014	<p>This is mostly related to interfacing with SABHRS (invoicing and time tracking)</p>	Dave Nagel
EPA CROMERR compliance	11/24/2014	<p>The UST program has concerns that they may have to be CROMMER compliant.</p>	Dave Nagel

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: June 2015

		<p>Only 3 forms of concern, regulated under Title 40:</p> <p>Notification (full & change of owner) Certificate of Compliance Financial Responsibility Certificate</p> <p>*These could potentially be filled out online, printed, signed and uploaded back to the department</p>	
--	--	---	--

E. Additional Comments

Please consider including any diagrams, charts, pictures or other visuals that will help the committee better understand the project.